

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/598,583	09/05/2006	Adrianus Josephus Bink	NL04 0236 US1	7385	
65913 NXP, B,V,	7590 12/08/2	009	EXAM	EXAMINER	
NXP INTELI	LECTUAL PROPERT	PETRANEK, JACOB ANDREW			
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKA	Y DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, O			2183		
				ı	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/08/2009	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/598,583	BINK ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jacob Petranek	2183		

	Jacob Petranek	2183	l
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	vhich places the r (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing     The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.1969. The date in have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of a funder of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office ther may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property of the pr	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	cted claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	·····,		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ol>		l be entered and an e	cplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
	/David J. Huisman/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2183	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues "the Examiner's proposed modification of the Hennessy reference undermines the operation of Hennessy. Consistent with the recent Supreme Court decision ... 103 rejetion cannot be maintained when the asserted modification undermines either the operation or the purpose of the main (Hennessy) reference ..." The examiner disagrees for the following reason. The applicant has neither identified what operation or purpose is undermined by the modification. The main purpose of the Hennessy reference is to execute MIPS instructions in a simple 5-stage pipeline. The proposed modification allows for ALU instructions to retire early in the fourth pipeline stage instead of the hip pelien est age when there is no resulting writeback contention on the register file. Thus, the modification offers performance advantages and clearly isn't undermining any operation of the pipeline of Hennessy. Thus, the rejection is maintained.